DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 638 JC 880 251

AUTHOR Martorana, S. V.; And Others
TITLE Abreast of the Lawmakers: State Level Public Policy Affecting Community College Education, Input 1984. A Report to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC).
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE Dec 85
NOTE 51p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; College Administration; College Programs; *Community Colleges; Court Litigation; Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Trends; Institutional Cooperation; National Surveys; Public Policy; School Personnel; *State Legislation; Trend Analysis; *Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Since 1975, the Center for the Study of Higher Education, the Pennsylvania State University, and the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges have cooperated in an annual study to identify and analyze pertinent state legislation affecting two-year colleges throughout the United States, to examine the issues which attract public policy action and attention, and to identify trends. An analyis of 1983 legislation, based on information provided by 31 state officials in the 50 states and 4 U.S. territories, revealed that: (1) the level of legislative activity ranged from 1 to 114 pieces of legislation, with the average being 18; (2) finances, administration, personnel, students, and academic programs were the major legislative concerns, while physical facilities and institutional growth were the focus of the least legislative activity; (3) concern for educational quality was only expressed indirectly through legislation dealing with academic programs; (4) there was a decline in student-related legislation and a shift in the emphasis of this legislation to tuition, loans and scholarships, and student mobility across state lines; (5) 12 relevant court cases, most dealing with personnel issues, were reported; and (6) 19 states indicated that a public policy existed to guide cooperation between and among publicly controlled colleges, lower schools, business and industry, and state governmental agencies. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294638

ABREAST OF THE LAWMAKERS: STATE LEVEL PUBLIC POLICY AFFECTING COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION, INPUT 1984

A Report to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges (NCSDCJC)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S.V. Martorana

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by:

S. V. Martorana,
Peter H. Garland,
and
Pamela D. Blake

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 880 251

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
325 Pond Laboratory
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

December 1985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

I. HIGHLIGHTS OF 1985 REPORT 1

II. BACKGROUND, PROCEDURES, COVERAGE OF JURISDICTIONS 4

III. LEVEL OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS BY STATES, TYPE, AND TOPIC . 9

IV. COURT CASES 21

V. POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR INTERORGANIZATIONAL COOPERATION . . . 27

VI. OVERVIEW, MAJOR OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION . 38

REFERENCES 45

NOTES ON THE AUTHORS 47

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 1. Jurisdictions Responding to Requests for 1984 Legislation and Related Material 7

TABLE 2. Significant Legislation by State and Status of Legislation 10

TABLE 3. 1984 Reported State Legislation by State, Broad Topic, and Status of Legislation 11

TABLE 4. Total of Legislation by Type 13

TABLE 5. Legislation on Broad Topics as a Percentage of Total Legislation, 1983 and 1984 16

TABLE 6. Number and Percentage of Public Policy Documents Covering Interorganizational Cooperation by Scope and Purpose of Cooperation 29

TABLE 7. Topics and Subtopics Concerning Cooperation Addressed in Policy Documents for Interorganizational Cooperation 34

I.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 1985 REPORT

* * * Two-thirds of the 55 political jurisdictions of the nation contacted (50 states, District of Columbia, 4 U.S. territories) responded to requests for 1984 legislation information.

* * * Although there appears to be some evidence on which to conclude that the level of relevant state legislation considered from year to year is stabilizing, this level is so high that state offices responsible for community, junior, and two-year technical colleges, as well as other leaders of community college education, must still be advised to maintain a close surveillance of that activity every legislative year.

* * * The level of legislative activity varies widely among states reporting legislative action; the range among 31 states reporting legislation during 1984 is from 1 piece to 114 pieces; the average was 18.8 pieces of legislation.

* * * Patterns of topics on which state legislation focused vary somewhat from state to state, but common concentrations of concern are evident on the topical areas of finance, administration, personnel, students, and academic programs. Physical facilities and institutional growth are topical areas with lowest activity levels reported.

* * * Legislation reflecting concern about quality in two-year college education directly is not evident; however, that concern is

evident indirectly in legislation dealing with academic programs.

* * * A decline in student-related legislation along with a change in the student-related issues evident in such legislation are evident in items considered in 1984, with more legislation focusing on matters of tuition, loans and scholarships, and student mobility across state lines.

* * * Of 21 states responding to the request for information about relevant court cases during a year preceding, 6 reported such action occurred, with a total of 12 cases reported. Most dealt with personnel issues.

* * * The observed high and rising level of legislative activity dealing with personnel matters and the fact that personnel issues dominate the reasons for the court cases reported suggest a relationship that merits more notice in the field as well as more research attention.

* * * About half of the states appear to have acted to establish a public policy to guide interorganizational cooperation in the field; 35 states responded to the inquiry about the public policy framework for interorganizational cooperation, with 19 indicating a public policy existed on the matter and forwarding a total of 42 documents for analysis.

* * * Policy documents on interorganizational cooperation most often touch upon cooperative projects involving publicly controlled

colleges, lower schools, business and industry, and state governmental agencies. Least frequently found are policy statements directed to cooperative ventures involving privately controlled colleges and local governmental agencies; none mentioned cooperation with the federal government or agencies.

* * * In terms of purposes of cooperative projects, policy statements most frequently touched upon the provision of greater access for students, efficient use of physical plant, economic development, and the efficient use of personnel; the objective of direct reduction of costs was mentioned less frequently.

* * * Policies touching on more specific aspects of interorganizational cooperation are found to deal most with matters of eligibility for participation, delineation of program objectives, and reporting requirements.

* * * Significantly, finance (including indications of sources of funds) and incentives of any kind to encourage cooperative efforts were addressed in less than one-fourth of the policy documents; this finding raises questions about the potential of success of efforts to promote interorganizational cooperation.

II.

BACKGROUND, PROCEDURES, COVERAGE OF JURISDICTIONS

Background

Since 1975, the Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, and the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges have cooperated on an annual survey and review of state legislation affecting community-college education, broadly defined as that sphere of the American post-high school educational enterprise encompassed by institutions highly committed to serving a particular local area or region of a state and offering programs leading to an associate degree as the highest academic award granted. Results of the study are presented in an annual report to the Council, and this is the eleventh in the series.

The annual survey and report seek to accomplish two purposes to serve both state directors and leaders of community-based institutions at the local and regional level. One goal is to identify and analyze pertinent state legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges throughout the United States, to probe analytically into the nature of issues which attract public policy action and attention, and to point at trends in those observations as the annual studies go on. The second broad objective is to extend the inquiry to help develop better understanding of the framework of public policy within which community colleges and related institutions must operate. This is done in two ways: first, by reporting briefly on court cases reported each year by the state contacts as involving the institutions

of interest to the annual report and, second, by asking for field comment on a current issue or development believed to have implications for the policy direction of institutions involved in community college education.

This report covers the major findings emanating from the analysis of the state data done by the co-authors covering the 1984 legislative sessions, a review of court cases held in that year, and a more direct inquiry into policies on interorganizational cooperation. In reporting on these matters, we will highlight several trends which can be noted by relating the 1984 findings to ones found in the preceding annual studies. Basic information for the report was provided by state officials in each of the 50 states, the several territories of United States, and the District of Columbia.

Procedures

Data collection and analysis procedures followed those outlined in previous reports in this series.[1] For the survey of 1984 legislative sessions, requests for information, besides calling for information about appropriations and court cases as well as for proposals to and enactments by the legislature, asked state directors to provide information on a special topic of interest to the field. Prompted by the increasing interest, observed in recent years, in cooperative projects involving community colleges and related

[1] Recent previous reports in this series include: Martorana and Garland (1984a and 1985), Martorana and Corbett (1983), and Martorana and Broomall (1982). Full citations of these and other reports are included in the references.

institutions with lower schools, other postsecondary institutions, business and industry, and federal, state, and local agencies, we asked directors to supply information about public policy in their states relating to such interorganizational cooperation.

Legislative actions reported were analyzed against the design for classifying the status of the legislation and the topics with which it dealt which has been used in prior year reports. In the design, the status of legislation is recorded as enacted, not enacted, or pending as of the close of the data gathering phase. Subject matter topics used this year repeated those established earlier and carried the analysis to broad areas of concern, for example, administration, programs, personnel, and students.

Coverage of Jurisdictions

Thirty-seven states and one United States territory responded to the request for legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges seriously considered in 1984 legislative sessions, as can be seen in Table 1, serious consideration was defined as reporting out of committee to a legislative house. These respondents represent 67.3% of the 55 political units (50 states, District of Columbia, and 4 United States territories) who were asked to supply information on legislative activity affecting community college education.

Thirty states, or 54.5% of the jurisdictions, responded to the request for appropriations information, while 21 states, or 38.2%, responded to the request for information on court cases decided

TABLE 1

Jurisdictions Responding to Requests for 1984 Legislation and Related Material

State	Legislation	Appropriations	Court Cases	Special Topic: Cooperation
Alabama				
Alaska				X
Arkansas	X	X		X
Arizona	X	X		X
California	X	X		X
Colorado	X			X
Connecticut	X	X	X	X
Delaware	X	X	X	X
Florida	X	X		X
Georgia	X	X	X	X
Hawaii				
Idaho				
Illinois	X	X	X	X
Indiana	X	X		X
Iowa	X	X	X	X
Kansas	X			
Kentucky	X	X	X	X
Louisiana	X	X	X	X
Maine				
Maryland	X	X	X	X
Massachusetts	X	X		X
Michigan				
Minnesota	X	X		
Mississippi	X	X	X	X
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraksa				X
Nevada	X	X		X
New Hampshire	X			X
New Jersey				
New Mexico	X			X
New York	X		X	X
North Carolina	X	X		
North Dakota	X			X
Ohio	X	X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	X	X
Oregon				
Pennsylvania	X	X	X	X
Rhode Island	X	X	X	X
South Carolina	X	X	X	X
South Dakota				
Tennessee	X	X	X	X
Texas	X	X		X
Utah	X	X	X	X
Vermont				
Virginia	X	X	X	X
Washington	X	X	X	X
West Virginia				
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X
Wyoming	X	X	X	X
District of Columbia				
Virgin Islands	X			
Puerto Rico				
Northern Marianas				
Guam				
TOTALS	37	30	21	35

between July 1, 1983, and June 30, 1984, bearing significantly on community, junior, and two-year technical colleges. Of the 21 states responding, 6 states reported 12 cases. Thirty-five states, or 63.6% of the jurisdictions, responded to the request for public policy documents affecting interorganizational cooperation.

III.

LEVEL OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS BY STATES, TYPE, AND TOPIC

In all, as evident in Table 2, 583 pieces of legislation were reported by 31 states. Four hundred and ninety pieces of legislation were reported as enacted, or 84.0% of the total pieces reported. In a like manner, 28 pieces, or 4.8% of the total, were reported as pending, and 65 pieces were reported as not enacted, representing 11.2% of the total. In each of these cases, only legislation seriously considered, that is, legislative proposals which at least passed the original committee to which they were assigned, were included for analysis.

From Table 2, it also can be seen that the number of pieces considered ranged from a single piece (New Mexico and Wyoming) to 114 pieces in California. The mean of legislative items reported per jurisdiction of those reporting was 18.8.

That both strong similarities and notable differences exist among the states in both the level of legislative activity and the topics of concern are generalizations that emerge from the data in Table 3. Considering only the legislation enacted, for example, the pattern shown by California is one of a state with very high level of activity reported, where most centered on items related to administration (34 of 114 items), along with considerable attention to programs (25 items), finance (22), and personnel (16), while the state with the next highest level of activity (Connecticut, 35 items) shows most attention going again first to matters of administration (16), with

TABLE 2

Significant Legislation by State and Status of Legislation

State	Enacted # of pieces	Pending # of pieces	Not Enacted # of pieces	Total # of pieces
Alabama	4	1	0	5
Alaska (3)	--	--	--	--
Arizona	23	10	3	36
Arkansas (1)	--	--	--	--
California	114	0	0	114
Colorado	8	0	0	8
Connecticut	35	0	0	35
Delaware	1	0	0	1
Florida	20	0	28	48
Georgia	27	0	0	27
Hawaii (3)	--	--	--	--
Idaho (3)	--	--	--	--
Illinois	11	0	0	11
Indiana	21	0	0	21
Iowa	11	0	0	11
Kansas	13	--	--	13
Kentucky (2)	5	0	0	5
Louisiana	15	0	0	15
Maine (3)	--	--	--	--
Maryland	27	0	0	27
Massachusetts	4	0	0	4
Michigan (3)	--	--	--	--
Minnesota	8	0	0	8
Mississippi (3)	--	--	--	--
Missouri	16	0	0	16
Montana (3)	--	--	--	--
Nebraska (3)	--	--	--	--
Nevada (2)	--	--	--	--
New Hampshire (2)	--	--	--	--
New Jersey (3)	--	--	--	--
New Mexico	1	0	0	1
New York	20	0	0	20
North Carolina	23	0	0	23
North Dakota (2)	--	--	--	--
Ohio	22	0	0	22
Oklahoma	8	0	14	22
Oregon (3)	--	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	10	12	0	22
Rhode Island	5	0	0	5
South Carolina	4	0	20	24
South Dakota	--	--	--	--
Tennessee	6	0	0	6
Texas (2)	--	--	--	--
Utah	2	0	0	2
Vermont (3)	--	--	--	--
Virginia	16	5	0	21
Washington	9	0	0	9
West Virginia (3)	--	--	--	--
Wisconsin (3)	--	--	--	--
Wyoming	1	0	0	1
District of Columbia (3)	--	--	--	--
Guam (3)	--	--	--	--
Northern Marianas (3)	--	--	--	--
Puerto Rico (3)	--	--	--	--
Virgin Islands (2)	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	490	28	65	583

(1) No legislative session (2) No legislation reported (3) No response

TABLE 3

1984 Reported State Legislation by State, Broad Topic, and Status of Legislation

State	Finance			Administration			Facilities			Institutional Growth			Personnel			Student			Programs			TOTAL		
	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N	E	P	N
Alabama	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-
Arizona	9	1	-	8	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	6	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	23	10	3
Arkansas*																								
California	22	-	-	34	-	-	8	-	-	1	-	-	16	-	-	8	-	-	25	-	-	114	-	-
Colorado	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-
Connecticut	9	-	-	16	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	35	-	-
Delaware	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Florida	5	-	5	8	-	8	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	11	2	-	2	-	-	2	20	-	28
Georgia	8	-	-	10	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	-	-
Illinois	6	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	11	-	-
Indiana	10	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	-	-
Iowa	5	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-
Kansas	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-
Kentucky	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	5	-	-
Louisiana	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	15	-	-
Maryland	9	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	27	-	-
Massachusetts	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	-	-
Minnesota	4	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-
Missouri	9	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	16	-	-
Nevada**																								
New Hampshire**																								
New Mexico	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
New York	6	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	20	-	-
North Carolina	11	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	23	-	-
North Dakota**																								
Ohio	8	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	22	-	-
Oklahoma	4	-	5	3	-	3	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	1	8	-	14
Pennsylvania	7	4	-	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	10	12	-
Rhode Island	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	5	-	-
South Carolina	1	-	5	3	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	3	4	-	20
Tennessee	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-
Texas**																								
Utah	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
Virginia	4	-	-	8	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	3	-	-	1	-	16	5	-
Washington	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	9	-	-
Wisconsin***																								
Wyoming	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Virgin Islands***																								
TOTALS	160	5	15	148	8	18	19	-	1	6	-	1	74	9	15	41	4	8	42	2	7	490	28	65

* No Legislative Session; ** No Legislation Reported; *** No Applicable Legislation

E -- Enacted; P -- Pending; N -- Not Enacted

the next being finance (9) and students (4). The third most actively reported states, Georgia (27) and Maryland (27) showed still other variations, with Georgia having personnel (6) as its third ranking topic of concern and Maryland having a quite different order: finance (9), students (7), and administration and personnel tied with 5 items each.

Turning to Table 4, it can be seen that finance and administrative issues tended to dominate legislative issues considered. This continues a trend noted by Martorana and Garland (1984) and Martorana and Corbett (1983). One hundred and eighty pieces of legislation, or 30.9% of all legislation seriously considered, dealt with financial topics including general and special appropriations for operations, capital fund appropriations, and financial procedures. Administrative issues, encompassing governing boards, administrative operations and procedures, studies and surveys, and the like accounted for 174 pieces of legislation, or 29.9% of legislation reported. Together, the broad categories of finance and administration encompassed 354 pieces of legislation and account for 60.8% of all legislation reported. This represents a small increase over 1983 legislation (Martorana & Garland, 1984).

After finance and administration, the next most numerous category was that of personnel. Ninety-eight pieces of legislation dealt with this topic, or 16.8% of legislation reported. Evident stimuli for this kind of legislation are concerns about Social Security and related retirement plans and effects of collective bargaining agreements.

TABLE 4

Total of Legislation by Type

Topic	Enacted # of pieces	Pending # of pieces	Not Enacted # of pieces	Total # of pieces	Percent of Total
Finance	160	5	15	180	30.9
Administration	148	8	18	174	29.9
Personnel	74	9	15	98	16.8
Students	41	4	8	53	9.1
Academic Programs	42	2	7	51	8.7
Physical Facilities	19	--	1	20	3.4
Growth	6	--	1	7	1.2
TOTAL	490	28	65	583	100.0

Student issues accounted for 9.1% of all legislation considered. A total of 53 pieces of legislation dealt with this topic.

Almost as numerous as student issues, academic programs were the topic of 51 pieces of legislation, or 8.7% of total legislation reported. In this category there is some evidence of factors generating legislative concern being less the wish to emphasize special programs (a factor noted in earlier reports in this series) and to generating legislation on such programs as "hi-technology," "women's centers," and the like, and more a concern for the academic programs in general offered by community colleges. Georgia, Louisiana, and Tennessee, for example, have acted to establish programs intended to develop "eminent scholars" among all students in higher education, including those in two-year colleges in those states.

Few pieces of legislation dealt with physical facilities or institutional growth. These categories accounted for just 3.4% and 1.2% of all legislation, respectively. The first of these findings, that concerning physical facilities, takes on more significance when the level of legislation in the area in 1984 is compared to earlier years, and we will comment again on it later in this section. The second finding concerning institutional growth is not surprising in light of current general expectations of stabilizing or declining enrollments in higher education, coupled with developments in greater use of new telecommunications technology to bring academic instruction to students wherever they are located.

On Table 5 it can be seen that, as a percentage of total legislation considered, there were only small shifts in the relative importance of the topics from 1983 to 1984. Finance, administration, and physical facilities each took a larger share of the total, while institutional growth, personnel, students, and academic programs represented a smaller share of the total. While these shifts were small, they can represent important trends-in-the-making.

Stabilizing Amount of Legislation. Last year, we reported that "the most enduring trend since the current annual review of legislation affecting the two-year college was initiated has been the increase in legislation reported each year" (Martorana & Garland, 1984a, p. 6). There are indications that the amount of legislation reported may have stabilized. Taking only those states that reported legislation in both 1983 and 1984 (29 states) a comparison was made between total number of legislation pieces in each year. In 1983, these states reported 541 pieces of legislation, while in 1984 they reported 529 pieces, a decrease of 2.2%.

Whether or not this is the beginning of a trend, however, must be approached with some caution. First of all, we did not have a 100% response rate as we have had in the past two years, so it may be impossible to generalize on the basis of only a 29-state segment of states. In other words, the amount of legislation considered in each state fluctuates and those states for which we have no data may have had active legislative calendars.

TABLE 5

Legislation on Broad Topics
as a Percentage of Total Legislation,
1983 and 1984

Topic	1983 (N = 541)*	1984 (N = 529)*	Difference
Physical Facilities	1.5	3.4	+ 1.9
Administration	28.3	29.9	+ 1.6
Finance	29.6	30.9	+ 1.3
Personnel	17.4	16.8	- .6
Institutional Growth	2.1	1.2	- .9
Academic Programs	10.2	8.7	- 1.5
Students	11.2	9.1	- 2.1

*NOTE: N's are of legislation reported by number of states (29) reporting on legislative action in both 1983 and 1984; states not responding to survey in 1984 or not having sessions in 1983 or 1984 are not included.

Second, the percentage of legislation introduced that became enacted was higher than it was last year. In 1983, 54.5% of legislative items reported were enacted, as opposed to 84.0% reported as enacted in 1984. The lack of increase in legislation, as reported in other years, may then be due to states more selectively sending only enacted legislation. On the other hand, the greater percentage of items reported as enacted may represent greater "success" (as measured by enactment) of legislation affecting the two-year college.

Further study based on full response is needed before concluding that amount of legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges has stabilized or reversed a 10-year pattern of growth. Similarly, additional study would be warranted to determine if (1) states reported mainly enacted legislation to the exclusion of pending or not enacted legislation, and/or (2) an increasing amount of legislative items of significance to two-year colleges is becoming enacted.

Aside from these questions, it is important to note that amount of legislation that affects two-year colleges remains considerable and attention to legislation points to a major responsibility of state offices responsible for community colleges. Theirs is the primary duty of monitoring such activity and for assessing the impact it will have on the institutions they direct or coordinate. Furthermore, it is not simply the amount of legislation that is of significance each year, but the content of that legislation. The broad topics covered and the change of level of attention to them are shown in Table 5.

Waning Interest in Special Programs. Last year we reported substantial increases in the amount of legislative attention to academic programs (Martorana & Garland, 1984a and 1984b). These programs consisted largely of job-training and retraining programs, in many cases with the federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) serving as catalyst. However, with the majority of state responses to that initiative occurring in 1983, as well as a decline in the unemployment rate, legislative activity has waned in this area (see Table 5). Responses to JTPA were limited to clean-up legislation, altering state/local agency relationships (California), and to more comprehensive actions in those states which did not have 1983 legislative sessions (Kentucky). In 1984, 8.7% of legislation dealt with this topic, versus 10.2% in 1983.

More Attention to Physical Facilities. The increased interest in legislation affecting physical facilities is due largely to attention to facilities construction (California, Colorada) and to miscellaneous building regulations in several states. This category represented 1.5% of legislative items in 1983 and 3.4% in 1984. Attention to physical facilities is likely to grow as buildings constructed in the boom of the 'sixties face more major maintenance needs. In this connection, the finding reported by Wattenbarger and Mercer (1985) in a recent study of financing community colleges is worth noting. They report that in 1984, state-level financing showed cutbacks to save funds to " . . . include deferred maintenance of existing buildings (even as new ones are being constructed)" (p. 54).

Changing Nature of Student Issues. While student issues, as a percentage of legislation considered, decreased from 11.2% in 1983 to 9.1% in 1984, that legislation focuses almost exclusively in three areas. First, the trend in extending tuition waivers or other tuition benefits to special groups within states that we reported in 1984 continues. States considered legislation to extend tuition benefits to veterans (Arizona, Connecticut), members of the armed services or National Guard (Colorado, North Carolina, Maryland), state employees (Florida), displaced homemakers (Maryland), and senior citizens (New York, Washington).

Second, there is considerable interest in the area of student loans and scholarships. Legislation concerning merit scholarships and grants was considered in Connecticut, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, and Mississippi. State-sponsored loans, in excess of federal loan programs, were considered in Colorado and Mississippi. These reflect dual thrusts--the concern for quality and the concern that federal programs may be insufficient for meeting the educational finance needs of parents and students. In another view, California and Colorado have enacted legislation prohibiting state income tax refunds to those who have defaulted on student loans. This represents growing concern for loan defaults.

And third, there has been some attention to the issue of student mobility within and across state lines. Arizona enacted legislation leading to out-of-state tuition waiver for contiguous states, while New Mexico is studying tuition reciprocation with Colorado. New York considered legislation to ease financial burdens for students and

localities for student mobility. Oklahoma considered, but did not enact, legislation to grant in-state tuition status for residents of certain Arkansas counties attending school in Oklahoma. Attention to student mobility suggests increasing public policy aimed at student freedom of choice.

IV.

COURT CASES

Review of the 1983-1984 court cases indicates support of trends noted last year (Martorana & Garland, 1984). In that report of 1983 state legislation, it was suggested that personnel issues would be an important area of concern in the future. The court cases reported by junior colleges for the period July 1, 1983, to June 30, 1984, reflect this concern.

Of the 21 states responding to the question on relevant court caess, 15 consisted of letters indicating no significant cases for the specified period. Responses from the other six states yielded 12 court cases. New York reported the most cases, seven. The other states reporting cases were Washington, Maryland, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Kentucky.

Five of the 12 cases were concerned with personnel issues. Issues addressed in the other cases were unemployment benefits, state operation regulations, miscellaneous affairs, and computer networking. Following is a brief annotation of the cases:

Personnel

Faculty Retrenchment at a Community College (New York)

Paloumpis v. Onondaga Community College Federation of Teachers

The court held that respondent's grievance concerning retrenchment of a community college faculty member was within scope of the collective bargaining agreement. The case was tried in the

Supreme Court, Appellate Division. A complete explanation of the complaint was not provided.

Violation of First Amendment Rights (New York)

Mahonney v. Hankin

A faculty member brought suit against a community college, its president, and others for allegedly violating the first amendment rights. The president of the college, via a letter, informed faculty members that discussion of controversial college matters in the classroom violated collective bargaining agreement. Also, further discussions could possibly result in professional charges. This was a civil rights case filed in federal court. No decision was made available.

Elimination of Faculty Positions (New York)

Brown v. Board of Trustees of North Country Community College

Petitioner claimed that resolutions eliminating certain faculty positions at a community college did not fall within the scope of the grievance procedure contained in the collective bargaining agreement between the faculty association and the Board of Trustees. The case was dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

Breach of Contract (Washington)

Roger Carlstrom & Yakima Valley College Federation of Teachers v. State of Washington, et al.

The complaint in this Supreme Court case was college breach of contract, impairment of contractural rights in violation of the contract clauses of the Washington State and U.S. Constitutions,

deprivation of vested property rights without due process of law, and violation of 42 USC, 1983. The complaint was filed because the District, due to fiscal problems, had continuously postponed paying salary increases agreed to in the collective bargaining agreement. The case was still pending as of the time of this report.

Breach of Contract (Maryland)

Maryland State Teachers Association, et al. v. The State of Maryland

The plaintiffs petitioned that by modifying its pension plan, the state violated its employment contract with teachers and employees. This was in violation of the contract clause of the Federal Constitution. The U.S. District Court granted judgment in favor of the state. The judge held that impairment of the contract was prospective, affecting future accrual of benefits; the reform did not take away currently earned benefits; and it even allowed employees to keep their unlimited Cost of Living Adjustment (CCLA) in return for an increase in contributions from 5% to 7% of salary.

Unemployment Benefits

In Nebraska, the eligibility of part-time instructors for unemployment benefits was decided as subject to individual rulings throughout the State, and is not uniform. This was substantiated by the rulings of state boards/commissions in attached documents.

State Operating Regulations

Drimmer v. Board of Trustees (New York)

Drimmer, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Westchester Community College, challenged regulation promulgated by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York limiting state assistance to full opportunity community colleges. The Supreme Court, Appellate Division, held that (1) the Trustees had authority to limit assistance in a manner which resulted in a full opportunity college receiving less than 40% of its operating budget, and (2) the regulation was not arbitrary and capricious.

Computer Networking

Interinstitutional Cooperation

Board of Trustees of Ashland Independent School District, et al., v. Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky, et al.

This was a judicial review, heard in the Boyd Circuit Court, of a proposal to establish computer networking. It made a significant linkage of elementary and secondary school authorities with community college authorities to jointly conduct programs. The court approved the agreement.

Miscellaneous Affairs

Application of Statute (Wisconsin)

Ball v. Dis. No. 4, Area Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education

The complaint in this case centered on the application of a certain statute to the State Board's approval of the siting of the

Madison Area Technical College. The case was heard in the Circuit Court. The Court determined that the capital budget was, in fact, approved prior to January 31, 1980, and that the action of October 16, 1981, siting the campus, was merely an action further implementing the State Board's earlier approval, so no referendum was required.

Request for Student Information (New York)

Krauss v. Nassau Community College

Petitioner's request for the names and addresses of students enrolled at the community college was properly refused. The Supreme Court held that: (1) the college properly refused pursuant to the Buckley Amendment and State Freedom of Information Law; (2) the petitioner failed to demonstrate need for information and was not entitled to access pursuant to the Buckley Amendment; and (3) access could be withheld. The petition was dismissed.

Automatic Dismissal of Trustees (New York)

McDonough, et al. v. Murphy

Plaintiffs appealed action forcing them to vacate their position on a community college board of trustees for failure to file their oaths within the specified time period. The motion for appeal was dismissed.

Appeal of Course Grade (New York)

Pfaff v. Columbia-Greene Community College

Student filed an Article 78 petition to review determination of the community college which resulted in her receiving a grade of "C" in a course. The student failed to demonstrate that pursuit of

available administrative appeal would have been fruitless. The Supreme Court, Appellate Division, dismissed the case following its assertion that (1) student's failue to follow established procedure made exhaustion of administrative rule inapplicable, and (2) mere assertion that a constitutional right was infringed on did not exclude failure to pursue administrative procedures.

Conclusion

The foregoing presentation of 1983-84 court cases is to supplement the earlier presentation and discussion of state legislative activity in 1984. The intent is to examine the extent to which the issues in the court cases appear to parallel the concerns in the state legislation data. Evidence of a significant relationship is found in one area of concern: the court cases concentrated more on personnel issues than on any other single area of institutional operations.

V.

POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR INTERORGANIZATIONAL COOPERATION[1]

In addition to reporting on legislation, court cases, and appropriations, state directors were asked to provide evidence of public policy related to interorganizational cooperation. Specifically, state directors were asked to: (1) highlight legislative items seriously considered by 1984 legislatures which addressed interorganizational cooperation; (2) provide copies of policy documents adopted since 1978 by their board or agency concerning cooperation between and among institutions and other agencies and organizations; and (3) provide copies of policy documents adopted since 1978 by other agencies or boards which address the topic of cooperation or collaboration.

Of the 35 states which responded to this request, 19 or 54.3% indicated that a public policy existed on the matter and provided documents concerning interorganizational cooperation. If these statistics were to hold true for the entire 50 states, the conclusion suggested is that a little more than half of the states have acted to establish a public policy to guide interorganizational cooperation in the field. Advocates of such cooperation can get encouragement from this, particularly in view of the newness of the concept in higher education; antagonists can interpret it to suggest that the subject is

---

[1]Much of the text of this section is taken from the preliminary report on 1984 state legislation made to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges and from a paper presented by Martorana and Kuhns at the 1985 Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (see references).

not important or it would draw more public notice. The 19 states with policies provided 42 policy documents in which the topic was addressed.

Types of Policy Documents

Twenty-five, or 59.5%, of these 42 cooperative policy documents were in the form of agency regulations, while 15, or 35.7%, were in the form of legislation. The remaining two policy documents (4.8% of the reported policies) were in the form of gubernatorial directives or initiatives. As might be expected, legislation and agency policy documents contribute the majority of policy statements directed at cooperation; however, the involvement of governors' offices can be important. For instance, the governor's 1982 Executive Order on Job Training has been important in shaping interorganizational cooperation in North Carolina.

Policy Related to Scope and Purpose of Cooperation

Table 6 presents a summary of the extent to which the public policy documents made any reference to the scope and purposes of interorganizational cooperation. From that table, it can be seen that relevant public policy documents cover cooperation as it involves a variety of organizations and deals with a number of purposes. The majority of public policy documents for interorganizational cooperation had statements covering cooperation involving postsecondary institutions with colleges publicly controlled (69.0%) and with lower school systems (64.3%). About one-third of the

TABLE 6

Number and Percentage of Public Policy Documents Covering Interorganizational Cooperation by Scope and Purpose of Cooperation

Type of Interorganizational Cooperation	Number of Policy Documents (total N = 42)	Percent of Policy Documents
Scope		
other colleges (public)	29	69.0
lower school systems	27	64.3
business and industry	15	35.7
state government/agencies	14	33.4
other colleges (private)	8	19.0
local government/agencies	3	7.1
federal government/agencies	0	0.0
other	1	2.4
Purpose (I)		
efficient use of physical facilities	13	31.0
economic development	10	23.8
efficient use of academic support	10	23.8
efficient use of personnel	9	21.4
community socio-cultural improvement	1	2.4
for wider audiences	1	2.4
other	4	9.6
Purpose (II)		
provide greater access for students	20	47.6
produce stronger business/ industry links	12	28.6
more complete use of facility	9	21.4
reduce costs among cooperating institutions	8	19.0
provide wider range of choice	7	16.7
opportunities for adult/ continuing education	7	16.7
use faculty talents more fully	6	14.3
share library and learning resources	3	7.1
enable faculty to specialize	2	4.8
reduce student costs	0	0.0

reported policy documents addressed cooperation involving postsecondary institutions with business and industry (35.7%), and with state government and its agencies (33.4%). Cooperation between postsecondary institutions with other colleges privately controlled was mentioned in 19.0% of the policy documents reported. Types of involvement covered less frequently were cooperation with local governments and their agencies (7.1%) and other organizations (2.4%). Significantly, cooperative linkages involving the federal government or its agencies were not covered in any of the submitted policy documents.

Public policy documents pertinent to interorganizational cooperation were also analyzed in terms of coverage of policy elements related to the purposes set for cooperation. The analysis related policy to projects designed to serve a number of different purposes. The two sets of purposes shown in Table 6 result from an attempt to see purposes in interorganizational cooperation from both a narrow view concentrating on efficiency of use of postsecondary resources, along with their direct service to a locality concerned with economic and socio-cultural improvement, and a broader view carrying the question of purpose to a larger number of more specific objectives. The results can be seen again from Table 6.

The most frequently covered purpose in the policy documents submitted was the provision of greater access for students. Policy statements directed to this purpose in cooperation were found in one form or another in 47.6% of all policy documents. Concern about the efficient use of physical facilities was found in slightly less than

one-third of policy documents reported (31.0%). Similarly, the more complete use of physical facilities was addressed in 21.4% of policy documents. The purposes of economic development and the encouragement of stronger links between business and industry and postsecondary institutions, often related purposes, were covered in 23.8% and 28.6%, respectively, of all policy documents submitted.

Policy statements concerning the efficient use of personnel as a purpose in cooperation were noted in 21.4% of policy documents, while those having a related purpose, the fuller use of faculty talents, was found to be covered in 14.3% of policy documents. The efficient use of academic support was addressed in 23.8% of policy documents.

The objective of reducing costs as a purpose for cooperating institutions was covered in 19.0% of policy documents. Policy statements pertinent to cooperation in order to expand opportunities for adult and continuing education were found in 16.7% of policy documents. The least frequently covered purposes included other (9.6%), the sharing of library and learning resources (7.1%), enabling faculty to specialize (4.8%), cooperation to promote academic programs and services for wider audiences (2.4%), and the promotion of community socio-cultural improvement (2.4%). Surprisingly, cooperation with the purpose of reducing students' costs was not covered in any of the policy documents examined.

These figures suggest current public policy relative to cooperation in higher education is most heavily directed at cooperation involving lower schools and other colleges publicly controlled; over two-thirds of the documents had policy statements

covering these kinds of cooperative associations. Public policy seems next to be most concerned with college cooperation with business and industry, as well as with state government agencies; about one-third of the documents covered these. Little policy guidance is found concerning cooperation involving federal or local government agencies. Yet, elsewhere (see Martorana & Garland, 1984b), it has been reported that in response to officially expressed initiatives at all levels, federal, state, and local agencies, in cooperation with business and industry, are seeking to improve and expand postsecondary training efforts. One speculative explanation is that after a flurry of activity seen in the 1983 state legislative sessions in response to the Federal Job Training Partnership Act, attention in public policy for cooperation has shifted to other concerns. Another is that the organizations themselves (colleges, business, industry, etc.) are deliberately being given free hand, e.g., all levels of government are to develop new interrelationships as they see fit.

When the examination shifts to the purposes set to be accomplished by cooperation, a related pattern of concern is found. Policy coverage is found concerning access for students in more policy documents than any other purpose. But, among other purposes covered are linkages with business and industry and economic development. A cluster of purposes shows concern about efficiency in postsecondary education: use of physical facilities, academic support, and personnel.

Elements of Policy Coverage

Analysis of the public policy documents was carried to two levels; first, a set of broad topics with which cooperative projects can be concerned and, second, a set of more specific elements within each of the broader ones.

Looking first at the broad topics addressed in public policy documents as shown in Table 7, one can see that the public subject found in most documents concerned the intended gain, outcome, or public service to be accomplished from the cooperation under consideration; this was found in all 42 documents examined. The documents also heavily covered program objectives (73.8%), and governance matters in cooperative endeavors (64.3%). Program operations and structure for governance were also found in substantial proportions of the public policy documents (52.4% and 42.9%, respectively). Incentives for cooperative efforts were touched on in 23.8% of policy documents, while only 16.7% of policy documents addressed policies concerning finance.

Further examination of public policy direction of cooperation in higher education is possible by proceeding to the subtopics within each broad area shown in Table 7. With respect to intent behind cooperation or outcome expected, notice is directed to the expectation often of return both internally to participating institutions and externally to the larger society or economy. The outcome interest expressed in a very large majority of policy documents (88.1%) is internal; that is, it is intended to promote cooperation for the benefit of participants involved. A notable percentage of documents

TABLE 7

Topics and Subtopics Concerning Cooperation Addressed in Policy Documents for Interorganizational Cooperation[1]

Topic	Number of Policy Documents	Percentage of Policy Documents
DIRECTION OF INTENT OR SERVICE	42	100.0
Internal	37	88.1
External	11	26.2
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	31	73.8
Mandated	20	47.6
Permissive	16	38.1
GOVERNANCE	27	64.3
Structure	25	59.5
Personnel	13	31.0
Reporting Requirements	12	28.6
Staff	11	26.2
PROGRAM OPERATIONS	22	52.4
Defined Operations	20	47.6
Reporting Requirements	14	33.4
Personnel	9	21.4
STRUCTURE	18	42.9
Eligibility	15	35.7
Mandated Inclusion	8	19.0
Mandated Exclusion	1	2.4
INCENTIVES	10	23.8
Direct Financial	8	19.0
Indirect Financial	1	2.4
Status/Role	1	2.4
FINANCE	7	16.7
Source	7	16.7
Budgeting	0	0.0
Accounting	0	0.0
Reporting Requirements	0	0.0

[1]The number of policy documents which addressed subtopics generally adds up to more than the number of documents which address the broad topics. This is because a given policy document which addressed a broad topical area could also address two or more subtopics of the area.

(26.2%), however, indicated an intent that was external in focus, such as economic development.

Contrary to our expectations, policy directions concerning finance of cooperation were not found in many of the documents. When finance of cooperation was covered in policy documents, policy direction related to two things: (1) the source of funds, and (2) the fact that finances are to be related to incentives for action. The first is indicated by the fact that source of finances was covered in 16.7% of policy documents. The second is shown by the fact that under incentives, which was covered by 28.8% of the documents, 19.0% of them related finances directly to incentive for cooperation.

Documents were searched for references to structure of cooperative arrangements. In this category, eligibility of participant organizations was a topic of concern in over one-third of policy documents (35.7%). The involvement of certain organizations in the cooperative effort was mandated in 19.0% of policy documents. On the other hand, groups were specifically excluded in 2.4% of policy documents reported.

As previously mentioned, governance was a topic of considerable attention in policy documents for interorganizational cooperation. Policy statements pertaining to structures for governance of the cooperative venture (as opposed to structure of participation) were identified in 59.5% of the documents, while the matters of the role of participating personnel (31.0%), reporting requirements (28.6%), and staff for administering cooperation (26.2%) were covered in over one-fourth of policy documents reported.

Indication of mandated program objectives was found in 47.6% of policy documents, while 38.1% of policy documents showed a permissive stance in the identification and development of program objectives. Similarly, 47.6% of policy documents had statements which defined program operations. Reporting requirements for projects were specified in 33.4% of policy documents, while duties of particular personnel involved in cooperative projects were similarly specified in 21.4% of policy documents submitted.

An important finding from our analysis was that less than one-fourth of policy documents covered incentives for cooperative efforts (23.8%). Direct financial incentives were specified in 19.0% of policy documents, while indirect financial, establishment of a special role or status, and other incentives were each discussed in 2.4% of policy documents.

Reviewing the topics which received the greatest amount of attention in public policy documents reveals a pattern: those topics which dealt with intent in cooperation, objectives of cooperative efforts, governance, structure, and operations--those topics which dealt in a general sense with the structure and governance or administration of cooperative efforts--received more attention than those topics which dealt with finance of cooperative efforts. In fact, finance (including the source of funds) and incentives of any kind were each addressed in less than one-fourth of policy documents. This apparent lack of attention to these topics leads us to question the potential for success of efforts to promote interorganizational cooperation. Until a public policy of positive encouragement of

interorganizational cooperation is reinforced by stronger incentives, including fiscal assistance to help sustain operations, states cannot realistically expect significant advances in cooperation between and among colleges and universities, nor between them and other agencies and organizations providing related programs and services.

VI.

OVERVIEW, MAJOR OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION

This annual review and report is directed to help leaders in community college education to better understand the public policy framework within which it operates. State statutes more than any other authority determine what community colleges and related types of institutions can do and broadly how they can do it. A sound understanding and close awareness of the status and trends of change in that policy framework are essential to effective leadership at both levels of operation, institutional and state.

Persons responsible for leadership in community college education seek constantly to attain two ends that to others may appear to be paradoxical. One objective that advocates of community colleges and of the functions in postsecondary education these institutions perform (whether done by comprehensive community colleges or other types of associate-degree level institutions) strive toward is to make a clear case that this level and type of academic service is different from, although clearly related to, secondary education, on the one hand, and university-based higher education, on the other. Simultaneously, community college leadership is constantly examining the larger total complex of postsecondary education in order to determine how best to fit community college education into it.

The nature of this dual-directed effort, the reasons for its being, and its history and development are well treated in other places (Koos, 1929; Medsker, 1963; Gleazer, 1980; Cohen, 1984). Most

recently, Parnell sounded the call for a stronger recognition of community college education on grounds that without it, the important "neglected majority" of persons that postsecondary education ought to serve would likely not be accommodated (Parnell, 1985). And the changing relationship with governments at all levels that the dual-directed effort is creating has also been described recently (Martorana & Kuhns, 1985).

This quick reference to a basic continuing condition of American community college education is made to bring out this point: to expect to be successful in both prongs of purpose described above, community leaders need to know the public policy framework within which their colleges operate. They must work to acquire public policies that recognize and support their place and part in the total enterprise of postsecondary education. And they must be vigilant to ways that changes in public policy can change or redirect their mission.

In short, state directors of community colleges, along with others who lead such institutions, are well advised to keep closely informed about state legislation and the related developments which formulate public policy for postsecondary education in a state. Moreover, developments along the states need constant examination, for policy directions in several states, although separate, are also interrelated.

Major Observations and Discussion

In summing up this 1985 review and input to a better understanding of the state level public policy framework for community college education, we note first that all three perspectives used in developing this report for observing public policy as it takes shape produce insights worth noting. Actions by the state legislatures are basic, but court cases produce related case law, and administrative pronouncements (in this instance used in part to examine the public policy framework for interorganizational cooperation) build upon authorizations and limitations established in the basic statutes.

From our review of 1984 state legislative activity, we draw four major findings. First, while the amount of legislation reported affecting the two-year college continues at a high level, there are indications that it may have reached a plateau. This is suggested by the slight decrease in legislation for states reporting legislative activities in the past two years. It is, however, too early to tell conclusively. Whether it in fact is a trend and, if so, what factors cause it and the consequences it might have for the field are questions we will pursue as the annual surveys go on.

Second, within several of the topics, there are trends worthy of note. The amount of attention paid to the area of academic programs highlighted last year and coming as a result of federal legislation, appears to have waned. States, it appears, have made their legislative responses, and have moved on to other topics. However, within the broad range of academic programs, relevant legislation

seems to be more concerned with issues of quality than with programs aimed to serve special groups which promoted such legislation in the recent past.

Third, there is a small increase in the amount of attention to physical facilities, including new construction, bonds for renovation, and miscellaneous regulations. We highlight this area because as buildings age and facilities needs change, there is likely to be increased attention to deferred maintenance and renovations.

And fourth, activity in the student area is highlighted because of attention to merit scholarships, loans to supplement federal programs, and student mobility. Coupled with growing public policy aimed at cooperation to enhance student access, this suggests growing attention to student issues in the 1980s. With the worst of the enrollment crunch yet to face us, this attention should, perhaps, come as no surprise. Also worth noting within the broad topic of student issues is the apparent increasing attention to student mobility and the fact that legislation affecting tuition and related charges, inter-state tuition reciprocity agreements, portability of state-funded student financial aid seems more directed to assure student access to higher educational opportunity, including attendance at community colleges, than at purposes more protectionist of institutions within states. Whether or not this will continue to be the case as institutions are increasingly for students in a predicted stabilizing or declining pool again remains to be seen.

The fact that there is an evident growing attention in state legislation to personnel issues and that most of the court cases

involving community colleges held during the reporting year were generated by personnel issues is another observation provoking attention. How much of a connection, if any, exists between the two findings cannot be ascertained through the methods producing this report. The field, however, can view the observation as a question and a possible early alert of need for greater attention to legislation affecting personnel matters as it is being formulated.

The analysis of the policy documents for interorganizational cooperation reported above suggests that both legislation and agency regulations make important contributions to the public policy framework. Although from other sources, the direct influence of governor's office is known to exist, it appears less frequent as evident in such documents. The scope of activity addressed in public policy documents for interorganizational cooperation most frequently includes other postsecondary institutions publicly controlled and lower schools. Also frequently mentioned in policy documents cooperative efforts are business/industry and state governments and agencies. Less frequently mentioned in public policy documents are other colleges privately controlled, while the federal government was not found to be mentioned in policy documents submitted.

This seems to contradict other reports. Elsewhere, two of the co-authors reported on recent trends in the extent and nature of legislative interest in the promotion of business/industry employees for postsecondary institutions (Martorana & Garland, 1984) and noted that federal programs such as the Job Training Partnership Act affected state-level cooperative programs. It may well be that need

for legislative action on that topic peaked last year, for it now appears that after a flurry of interest in this area last year, legislative attention has turned to other areas. It is also possible that agency policy statements, which are expected to follow legislative initiatives, have not yet been fully formulated.

The most frequently indicated purposes for interorganizational cooperation found in policy documents were to assure greater access for students to higher education, more efficient use of physical facilities, economic development, stronger linkages with business and industry, and more efficient use of personnel. Interestingly, in view of the constant focus of attention on matters of fiscal concern, the objective of reducing costs as a purpose of interorganizational cooperation was found in policy documents to follow all of the foregoing five purposes in frequency of mention.

An important finding in our examination of the public policy documents was that relatively little attention is given to the provision of incentives for cooperative efforts. Policy directives pertaining to incentives were significantly less often indicated than were the ones pertaining to structures for and mode of operation of cooperative ventures, eligibility of organizations to participate, and outcomes or objectives to be achieved. The relatively low notice given to the need for incentives to cooperation and how to provide them led us to question the potential for success of efforts to promote interorganizational cooperation in postsecondary education.

Conclusion

In his foreword to the newly published Renewing the Community College, Clark Kerr says that the authors present a series of possibilities among which selections can and will be made, not a blueprint that must be followed. And then he asks, "What will the constraints and pressures and even fate ordain? What will free choice seize upon as most desired within the bounds that confine it? Nobody fully knows--including the authors of this volume. Yet there are all those blank pages of The Future to be written upon. Anyone who wants to help fill in those pages will do well to read and ponder these essays" (Kerr, 1985, p. viii).

We submit that, among others, the lawmakers, too, will help fill those pages of The Future of community college education in America. Some of them will do this consciously and deliberately, with an intent to make a difference in the enterprise. Others will do so indirectly, seeking to mold some other aspect of governmental service or operation, but in so doing also affecting community colleges. Whatever their motivation, the effect will be there. Our position, in wishing to serve the field, is to advise those concerned with the future of community college education to keep as closely abreast of the lawmakers as they possibly can. To help them follow that advice, we submit this report and turn to the task of producing the next.

REFERENCES

Cohen, A.M. and Brawer, F.B. The American Community College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Gleazer, E.J., Jr. The Community College: Values, Vision, Vitality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.

Kerr, C. Foreward to W.L. Deegan, D. Tillery, et al., Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Koos, L.V. The Junior College, New York: Ginn, 1929.

Martorana, S.V. and Kuhns, E. "The Public Policy Framework for Institutional Research Pertaining to Interorganizational Cooperation and Planning in Higher Education." Paper presented at Annual Forum, Association for Institutional Research, Portland, OR, April 30, 1985.

Martorana, S.V. and Kuhns, E. "New Structures for State and Local Collaboration," Chapter 10 in W.L. Deegan and D. TIllery et al., Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Martorana, S.V. and Broomall, J.K. State Legislation Affecting Community, Junior, and Two-Year Technical Colleges, 1981. University Park, PA: The Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, Report #38, 1982.

Martorana, S.V. and Corbett, P.C. State Legislation Affecting Community, Junior, and Two-Year-Technical Colleges, 1982. University Park, PA: The Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, Report #39, 1983.

Martorana, S.V. and Garland, P.H. "Highlights and Overview of Actions in 1983 State Legislative Sessions Affecting Community and Two-Year Technical Colleges." A report to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1984a.

Martorana, S.V. and Garland, P.H. "Public Policy for Economic Development: The Two-Edged Sword." Community and Junior College Journal, November, 1984b.

Martorana, S.V. and Garland, P.H. "Public Policy Actions Deemed Important by State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges." Community College Review, Spring 1985, 12:4, pp. 42-53.

Medsker, L.L. The Community College: Progress and Prospects. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Parnell, D. The Neglected Majority. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press, 1985.

Wattenbarger, J.L. and Mercer, S.L. Financing Community Colleges, 1985. Gainsville, FL: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1985.

NOTES ON THE AUTHORS

S.V. Martorana is Professor, College of Education; and Senior Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University. He has directed this series of 11 annual studies and reports and has actively monitored state legislation affecting community, junior, and two-year technical colleges since 1948.

Peter H. Garland is Program Analyst, Office of Higher Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education; a Ph.D. candidate in the Program in Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University; and former Research Assistant, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Pamela D. Blake is a Research Assistant, Center for the Study of Higher Education; and a D.Ed. candidate in the Program in Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 22 1988